

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/315,680

Applicant(s)
PETER NICHOLLS ET AL

Examiner
Frantzy Poinvil

Group Art Unit
2164

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Frantzy Poinvil (3) _____

(2) _____ (4) _____

Date of Interview Jun 26, 2001

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☒ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: _____

Identification of prior art discussed:

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

FRANTZY POINVIL
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2164

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/315,680

Applicant(s)
PETER NICHOLLS ET AL

Examiner
Frantzy Poinvil

Group Art Unit
2164

46

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Frantzy Poinvil

(3) Chris Guzik

(2) Gregory A. Stobbs

(4) Bill Silverio

Date of Interview Jun 26, 2001

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 1- 85

Identification of prior art discussed:
Shavit + Canna

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) N/A

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicants have clearly explained their invention and argued that Shavit and Canna failed to teach or suggest a rate server and a client application registering at a supervisory server for enabling mutual communication between them. The Examiner stated that the proposed claimed language appears to distinguish over Shavit + Canna and that a further review of the combined teachings would be necessary before making a final decision. A further search would be made.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Frantzy Poinvil
FRANTZY POINVIL
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2164